

0009



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Kathleen Clarke
Executive Director

Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210

PO Box 145801

Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

801-538-5340

801-359-3940 (Fax)

801-538-7223 (TDD)

March 6, 2002

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor *DRH*

FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Sr. Reclamation Specialist *GA*

RE: 2001 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, West Ridge Resource Inc., West Ridge Mine, C/007/041-WQ01-4

1. Were data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [x] NO []

Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.

See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling Due Date

Commitment to samples every fifth year, beginning with the first mid-term review (p. 7-20): first mid-term due 10/01/01.

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES [X] NO []

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

4. Were irregularities found in the data? YES [x] NO []

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

The depth to water at Well DH-86-2, which increased approximately 14.5-ft from 1998 through March 2001, has now dropped approximately 35-ft. since March 2001. Water levels dropped an additional 8-feet from the 3rd to 4th quarter. The field personnel conducting the fieldwork were contacted to verify the depths to water.

They confirmed the numbers and did not note any field observations that would explain the variance. Construction work conducted around the well lowered the surface casing approximately 5-ft from the 1st to 2nd quarter 2001, accounted for some of the variance noted earlier. The Operator has been questioned, and indicated no significant inflow of water into the mine has been encountered. This will continue to be monitored in the future.

Specific Conductivity values at Spring SP-16 were approximately 60 percent of anticipated values, which is also supported by the anticipated ratio of TDS to Specific Conductivity. Field personnel will check field notes to verify the values.\

No other irregularities were found in the data.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [x] NO []
2nd month, YES [x] NO []
3rd month, YES [x] NO []

Identify sites and months not monitored:

Both D001 and D002 showed no discharge

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES [] NO []

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Sites were dry so no parameters were reported, with the exception of 'No Discharge'.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES [] NO [x]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

No further action is necessary for the 4th Quarter 2001.